

REMARKS

Claims 10, 12, 14, 17, 19, 23, 24, 26 and 27 have been amended, claims 13, 15, 16, 20 and 21 have been canceled and new claim 28-35 has been added. Thus, claims 10-12, 14 17-29, and 23-35 are currently pending and presented for examination. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Response to Rejections Under Section 101:

Claims 10-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for lacking physical articles. Applicants respectfully submit that a component which can be addressed in a communication network and that has a storage mechanism is a physical article. However, to further prosecution of the instant application, Applicants have amended claim 10 to recite:

each component comprising: . . . a memory to store an address of the monitoring component when the respective component is being monitored

Not only is the component a physical article but the memory is also a physical article. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the Section 101 rejections.

Response to Rejections Under Section 112:

Claims 17 and 20-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph, the Examiner contending that that the disclosure is not enabling. Applicants have amended claim 17 and canceled claims 20 and 21. Amended claim 17 includes one scenario of visual indication which is enabled (see e.g. paragraph [0027]).

Claims 12-13, 16, 21 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph, the Examiner contending that terms “predetermined ... address(es)” is vague and indefinite. Applicants have amended claims 12 and 24, and canceled claims 13, 16, and 21. Applicants’ amended claim 17 recites “a maximum number of addresses stored is predetermined” and claim 24 has been similarly amended. Applicants respectfully submit that terms “predetermined” and “addresses” are clear and definite. Stored addresses are network address, such as an IP address, of the monitoring component and a predetermined maximum number of addresses may be stored (see e.g. paragraph [0027]).

Claims 19 and 26-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph, the Examiner contending that terms "stipulated intervals of time" is vague and indefinite. Applicants respectfully submit that "stipulated intervals of time" is not vague and indefinite and indicates a predetermined time interval.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the Section 112 rejections.

Response to Rejections Under Section 102:

Claims 10-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(b), the Examiner contending that these claims are anticipated by MCI Communications Corporation (International Publication No. WO 99/17523).

Applicants' Claim 10 recites:

each component: addressable in a communication network, monitorable by each of the other components via the processing unit, and equipped for monitoring each of the other components via the communication unit.

In contrast, MCI teaches that agents (20) are monitorable and that the CTI server (30) is equipped for monitoring. MCI does not teach or suggest that the agents (20) are also equipped for monitoring or that the CTI server (30) is monitorable. In view of the above, claim 10 is not anticipated by MCI. Furthermore, Claims 11-22 which depend on claim 10 are also patentable at least based on their dependence from claim 10 as well as based on their own merits.

For Example Applicants' Claim 14 recites:

the monitoring instruction comprises information about which changes of state are to be sent as state information.

The Examiner contends Figures 8-11 and Page 8 lines 8-23 reads on this limitation by stating various event types and agent attributes. 8-23. However, MCI merely teaches that the state information is provided from the monitoring component (CMITMS) to the monitoring component client. MCI does not teach or suggest that an instruction [sent to the monitored component] comprises which changes of state to send.

Furthermore, Applicants' Claim 23 recites:

directly transmitting the monitoring instruction by the monitoring component to the monitored component;

The Examiner contends Figures 3-4 Abstract and Page 1 lines 24-26 reads on this limitation mentioning [a] connection between a monitoring system and a server. However, MCI teaches that a monitoring system having a CTI server component (30), a CTIMS component (36) and a workstation component (38) are used to monitor the agent (20). However, MCI does not teach that a monitoring instruction is transmitted by the monitoring system or by a component in the system let alone that a monitoring instruction is transmitted directly from a component in the monitoring system to the monitored component. Moreover, merely having a connection between a monitoring system and a server does not teach or suggest that a monitoring instruction transmitted over the connection. In view of the above, claim 23 is not anticipated by MCI. Furthermore, Claims 24-27 which depend on claim 23 are also patentable at least based on their dependence from claim 23 as well as based on their own merits.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the Section 102 rejections.

New Claims:

New claims further define the scope of the invention as described in the specification and drawings. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding the other claims, Applicants respectfully submit claims 28-35 are patentable and requests allowance of claims 28-35.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and timely pass the application to allowance. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including fees for additional claims and terminal disclaimer fee, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11-08-07

By: Janet D. Hood
Janet D. Hood
Registration No. 61,142
(407) 736-4234

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830